IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

STATE OF OKLAHOMA)	
	Plaintiff,)))	
v.)	Case No. 4:05-cv-00329-GKF-PJC
TYSON FOODS, INC., et al.	Defendants.)))	

TYSON DEFENDANTS' MOTION IN LIMINE TO PRECLUDE DEPOSITION TESTIMONY OF PRESTON KELLER

Come now Defendants Tyson Foods, Inc., Tyson Chicken, Inc., Tyson Poultry, Inc., and Cobb-Vantress, Inc. (collectively "Tyson Defendants"), and hereby move the Court to preclude the use of Preston Keller's deposition testimony pursuant to Federal Rules of Evidence 702, 801, and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 32. In support thereof, the Tyson Defendants state as follows:

1. The Tyson Defendants seek to limit the use of the deposition testimony of Tyson's *former* employee, Preston Keller. Mr. Keller held various positions during his career at Tyson, culminating in his role as Director of Environmental Agriculture prior to voluntarily resigning on July 31, 2005, to pursue other opportunities. Ex. 1, Deposition of Preston Keller, 23:4-21 ("Keller Depo."). Plaintiffs have designated portions of Mr. Keller's October 15, 2008 deposition, and the Tyson Defendants expect, based on questions asked at the deposition and Plaintiffs' prior use of the testimony, that Plaintiffs will offer his testimony as judicial admissions of a party-opponent or for related, and equally impermissible, purposes.

- 2. The Tyson Defendants did not designate Mr. Keller as a corporate representative under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 30(b)(6), and he was not otherwise authorized to speak for and on their behalf. Instead, the Tyson Defendants identified and Plaintiffs deposed seven (7) Rule 30(b)(6) representatives who were authorized to speak for and on behalf of the Tyson Defendants. Plaintiffs also noticed and had the opportunity to depose Kevin Igli, a current Senior Vice President and Tyson's Senior Environmental Health and Safety Officer. The testimony from these *current* employees covers the same topics discussed in Mr. Keller's deposition. As such, the deposition of Mr. Keller, a former employee, should not and cannot be used at trial as an admission by party-opponent.
- 3. The rules governing the use of deposition testimony from former employees and the limitations thereon are described in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 32 and Federal Rule of Evidence 801(a)(2)(D). Foremost, Plaintiffs bear the burden of establishing the admissibility of the deposition they have designated. *See Garcia-Martinez v. City of Denver*, 392 F.3d 1187, 1191 (10th Cir. 2004). Plaintiffs' burden of establishing the admissibility of deposition testimony comprises a two-step analysis. *See* 8A WRIGHT, MILLER & MARCUS, FEDERAL PRACTICE & PROCEDURE § 2142, at 159. "First, the condition set forth in Rule 32(a) must exist before the deposition can be used at all. Second, when it is found that these conditions authorize the use of the deposition, it must be determined whether the matters contained in it are admissible under the rules of evidence." *Id*.
- 4. Specifically, with regard to the first portion of the analysis, Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 32(a)(3) provides that "[a]n adverse party may use for any purpose the deposition of a party or anyone who, *when deposed*, was the party's officer, director, managing agent, or

designee under Rule 30(b)(6) or 31(a)(4)." Fed. R. Civ. P. 32(a)(3) (emphasis added). As previously noted, Mr. Keller was not employed by the Tyson Defendants at the time of his deposition, making his deposition testimony inadmissible under the initial portion of this analysis.

- 5. Even were Plaintiffs able to satisfy their initial burden, they still cannot satisfy the second prong of the analysis. The admission-by-party-opponent provision in Federal Rule of Evidence 801(a)(2)(D) is narrowly defined and does not include the statements of former employees. Like Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 32(a)(3), the party-opponent provision has a temporal element that is not met by the deposition transcripts at issue. In this regard, admissions by party-opponents are limited to a statement offered against a party, which is "a statement made by the party's agent or servant concerning a matter within the scope of the agency or employment, *made during the existence of the relationship*." Fed. R. Evid. 801(d)(2)(D) (emphasis added). Accordingly, the designated portions of Mr. Keller's deposition cannot be offered as an admission by the Tyson Defendants.
- 6. If, however, the Court allows Plaintiffs to use Mr. Keller's deposition transcript at trial, the Tyson Defendants further move the Court to exclude any and all testimony from the transcript containing expert opinions. On several occasions during Mr. Keller's deposition, Plaintiffs attempted to solicit impermissible expert testimony. For example:
 - Q Okay, and when you say that, does that mean that if you land applied poultry waste which contains phosphorus -- let me ask it this way: You know poultry waste contains phosphorus, do you not?
 - A Yes.

¹ To the extent that Plaintiffs contend the deposition testimony satisfies one or more of the other categories in Rule 32(a), they nonetheless have the burden of demonstrating admissibility of the deposition testimony.

MR. BOND: Object to the form.

A If you apply it too close to the rain, you bet.

Ex. 1, Keller Depo, 100:19-101:4. Mr. Keller was never disclosed as a nonretained expert as required by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(2); Aumand v. Dartmoth Hitchcock Med. Ctr., 611 F. Supp. 2d 78, 88 (D.N.H. 2009) (listing authorities requiring disclosure of nonretained experts). Moreover, Plaintiffs made no effort during Mr. Keller's deposition to qualify him as an expert on any topic pertinent to this lawsuit. Even had such an attempt been made, Plaintiffs bear the burden of proving that a nonretained expert is qualified to give expert opinions on the matters upon which he has been asked to opine. See Ralston v. Smith & Nephew Richards, Inc., 275 F.3d 965, 970 n.4 (10th Cir. 2001). Plaintiffs have failed to meet this burden, and Mr. Keller's opinions on the various environmental, agricultural, and industry topics involved in this lawsuit do not satisfy the requirements for admissibility under, among others, Federal Rule of Evidence 702. As such, Plaintiffs should be prohibited from offering any of the testimony from Mr. Keller's deposition which amounts to an expert opinion on any topic pertinent to this lawsuit.

WEREFORE, Tyson Foods, Inc., Tyson Chicken, Inc., Tyson Poultry, Inc., and Cobb-Vantress, Inc. move the Court for precautionary instructions preventing Plaintiffs, their counsel, experts retained by Plaintiffs, and other witnesses offered by Plaintiffs from quoting, making reference to, or otherwise attempting to offer any designated portion of Mr. Keller's deposition testimony as an admission by Tyson Foods, Inc., Tyson Chicken, Inc., Tyson Poultry, Inc., or Cobb-Vantress, Inc. and further requests that Plaintiffs be precluded from offering Mr. Keller's testimony as an expert opinion on any issue before the Court.

BY: /s/ Michael R. Bond _

Michael R. Bond, appearing pro hac vice Erin Thompson, appearing pro hac vice Dustin R. Darst, appearing pro hac vice KUTAK ROCK LLP 234 East Millsap Road, Suite 400 Fayetteville, Arkansas 72703-4099 (479) 973-4200 Telephone (479) 973-0007 Facsimile

-and-

Robert W. George, OBA #18562 Bryan Burns, appearing pro hac vice TYSON FOODS, INC. 2210 West Oaklawn Drive Springdale, Arkansas 72762 (479) 290-4067 Telephone (479) 290-7967 Facsimile

-and-

Patrick M. Ryan, OBA # 7864 Stephen L. Jantzen, OBA # 16247 Paula M. Buchwald, OBA # 20464 RYAN, WHALEY & COLDIRON, P.C. 119 North Robinson, Suite 900 Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73102 (405) 239-6040 Telephone (405) 239-6766 Facsimile

-and-

Jay T. Jorgensen, appearing pro hac vice Thomas C. Green, appearing pro hac vice Mark D. Hopson, appearing pro hac vice Gordon Todd, appearing pro hac vice SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP 1501 K Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005-1401 (202) 736-8000 Telephone (202) 736-8711 Facsimile

Attorneys for Defendants Tyson Foods, Inc., Tyson Chicken, Inc., Tyson Poultry, Inc., and Cobb-Vantress, Inc..

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on the 5th day of August, 2009, I electronically transmitted the attached document to the Clerk of Court using the ECF System for filing and transmittal of a Notice of Electronic Filing to the following ECF registrants:

W. A. Drew Edmondson, Attorney General Kelly Hunter Burch, Assistant Attorney General drew_edmondson@oag.state.ok.us kelly_burch@oag.state.ok.us

Douglas Allen Wilson Melvin David Riggs Richard T. Garren Sharon K. Weaver Robert Allen Nance Dorothy Sharon Gentry Joseph P. Lennart David P. Page doug_wilson@riggsabney.com driggs@riggsabney.com rgarren@riggsabney.com sweaver@riggsabney.com rnance@riggsabney.com sgentry@riggsabney.com jlennart@riggsabney.com dpage@riggsabney.com

RIGGS ABNEY NEAL TURPEN ORBISON & LEWIS

Louis W. Bullock Robert M. Blakemore

BULLOCK BULLOCK & BLAKEMORE, PLLC

lbullock@bullock-blakemore.com bblakemore@bullock-blakemore.com

Frederick C. Baker William H. Narwold Elizabeth C. Ward Elizabeth Claire Xidis Ingrid L. Moll Jonathan D. Orent Michael G. Rousseau Fidelma L. Fitzpatrick MOTLEY RICE, LLC fbaker@motleyrice.com bnarwold@motleyrice.com lward@motleyrice.com cxidis@motleyrice.com imoll@motleyrice.com jorent@motleyrice.com mrousseau@motleyrice.com ffitzpatrick@motleyrice.com

COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFFS

A. Scott McDaniel
Nicole Longwell
Philip D. Hixon
Craig A. Mirkes
McDaniel Hixon Longwell & Acord, PLLC

smcdaniel@mhla-law.com nlongwell@mhla-law.com phixon@mhla-law.com cmirkes@mhla-law.com

Sherry P. Bartley sbartley@mwsgw.com

MITCHELL, WILLIAMS, SELIG, GATES & WOODYARD, PLLC

COUNSEL FOR PETERSON FARMS, INC.

Robert P. Redemann rredemann@pmrlaw.net
David C .Senger dsenger@pmrlaw.net

PERRINE, McGivern, Redemann, Reid, Berry & Taylor, PLLC

Robert E. Sanders E. Stephen Williams YOUNG WILLIAMS P.A. rsanders@youngwilliams.com steve.williams@youngwilliams.com

COUNSEL FOR CAL-MAINE FOODS, INC. AND CAL-MAINE FARMS, INC.

George W. Owens Randall E. Rose

gwo@owenslawfirmpc.com rer@owenslawfirmpc.com

THE OWENS LAW FIRM, P.C.

James M. Graves Gary V. Weeks Woody Bassett K.C. Dupps Tucker Earl Lee "Buddy" Chadick Vince Chadick

jgraves@bassettlawfirm.com gweeks@bassettlawfirm.com wbassett@bassettlawfirm.com kctucker@bassettlawfirm.com bchadick@bassettlawfirm.com vchadick@bassettlawfirm.com

COUNSEL FOR GEORGE'S INC. AND GEORGE'S FARMS, INC.

John R. Elrod Vicki Bronson Bruce W. Freeman D. Richard Funk P. Joshua Wisley

BASSETT LAW FIRM

jelrod@cwlaw.com vbronson@cwlaw.com bfreeman@cwlaw.com dfunk@cwlaw.com jwisley@cwlaw.com

CONNER & WINTERS, PLLC

COUNSEL FOR SIMMONS FOODS, INC.

John H. Tucker Colin H. Tucker Theresa Noble Hill Kerry R. Lewis

jtucker@rhodesokla.com chtucker@rhodesokla.com thill@rhodesokla.com

klewiscourts@rhodesokla.com

Colin C. Deihl

RHODES, HIERONYMUS, JONES, TUCKER & GABLE

Terry W. West

terry@thewestlawfirm.com

THE WEST LAW FIRM

Delmar R. Ehrich **Bruce Jones** Krisann C. Kleibacker Lee Todd P. Walker Melissa C. Collins FAEGRE & BENSON LLP

dehrich@faegre.com bjones@faegre.com kklee@faegre.com twalker@faegre.com mcollins@faegre.com

dmann@mckennalong.com Dara D. Mann

MCKENNA, LONG & ADLRIDGE, LLP

COUNSEL FOR CARGILL, INC. AND CARGILL TURKEY PRODUCTION, LLC

I also hereby certify that I served the attached documents by United States Postal Service, proper postage paid, on the following who are not registered participants of the ECF System:

J.D. Strong Secretary of the Environment State of Oklahoma 3800 North Classen Oklahoma City, OK 73118

/s/ Michael R. Bond Michael R. Bond